

REMARKS

I. Claim Objections

Claims 5, 6 and dependent claims 7 and 8 were objected to for reciting improper Markush language “selected from the group consisting essentially of”. Claims 5 and 6 have been amended to recite more conventional Markush language. It is intended that the scope of the amended claims has not been changed by the introduction of the more conventional language.

II. Claim Rejections

Claim 4 has been rejected as being anticipated by Beard et al which is described by the Examiner as a description of the entire genome of type O FMDV. For expediency and to provide additional clarity, Applicant’s have amended the claim to recite the transitional term “consisting essentially of” Applicants believe it is art recognized that primer directed nucleic acid amplification is intolerant of substantial changes to the primers utilized. The amendment find support at page 12, and throughout the specification. Applicants would respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn

III. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, allowance of the above-referenced application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/Edward F. Rehberg/

EDWARD F. REHBERG
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS
Registration No.: 34,703
Telephone: (302) 992-4123
Facsimile: (302) 892-1026

Dated: February 18, 2009